

Remarks

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, 15-19, 21-25, 27-30, 32-42, 44-54, 56-66, 68-114, 118-121, and 125-128 are pending, with claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 30, 42, 54, 66, 78, 87, 96, 105, 114, and 121 being independent. By virtue of this amendment, independent claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 30, 42, 54, 66, 114 and 121 have been amended, and claims 2, 8, 14, 20, 26, 31, 43, 55, 67, 115-117, and 122-124 have been canceled. No new matter is introduced.

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,150,042 to Tamano et al. (Tamano). Claims 25-128 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tamano in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,097,147 to Baldo et al. (Baldo).

Regarding the rejection of claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tamano, Applicant respectfully submits that Tamano does not disclose or properly suggest all of the features of at least independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 19.

For example, independent claim 1, as amended, recites:

A luminescent device:
comprising an organic luminescent element comprising:
an anode;
a cathode; and
a hole transporting layer provided between the anode and
the cathode, comprising a first compound and a second compound;
wherein the first compound is smaller in ionization
potential than the second compound,
wherein the second compound is larger in hole mobility
than the first compound, and
wherein there is a concentration gradient that a
concentration of the first compound is decreased toward the
cathode from the anode and a concentration of the second
compound is increased toward the cathode from the anode.

Applicant respectfully submits that Tamano does not disclose or suggest at least the recited feature(s) of, "wherein there is a concentration gradient that a concentration of the first compound is decreased toward the cathode from the anode and a concentration of the second compound is increased toward the cathode from the anode," nor does the Office Action assert

that Tamano discloses or properly suggests this feature(s), so that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least this reason.

Further, independent claims 7, 13, and 19 recite the same or similar feature(s), and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons, so that dependent claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-18, and 20-24 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons.

Regarding the rejection of claims 25-128 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tamano Baldo, Applicant submits the following remarks.

Regarding claims 25-77 and 114-128, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Tamano, nor Baldo, nor any proper combination of the two, discloses all of the limitations of at least independent claims 25, 30, 42, 54, 66, 114, and 121.

For example, independent claim 25 recites:

A luminescent device comprising:
an organic luminescent element comprising:
an anode;
a cathode;
a luminescent layer provided between the anode and the cathode;
and
a blocking layer adjacent to the luminescent layer, being provided
between the anode and the cathode;
wherein the blocking layer comprises a blocking material and a
material contained in the luminescent layer,
wherein an energy difference between a highest occupied
molecular orbit and a lowest unoccupied molecular orbit in the blocking
material is larger than an energy difference between a highest occupied
molecular orbit and a lowest unoccupied molecular orbit in a material
contained in the luminescent layer, and
wherein there is a concentration gradient that a concentration of the
material contained in the luminescent layer is decreased toward the
cathode from the anode and a concentration of the blocking material is
increased toward the cathode from the anode.

Applicant respectfully submits that Tamano does not disclose or suggest at least the recited feature(s) of, "wherein there is a concentration gradient that a concentration of the material contained in the luminescent layer is decreased toward the cathode from the anode and a concentration of the blocking material is increased toward the cathode from the anode," nor does

the Office Action assert that Tamano discloses or properly suggests this feature(s), so that independent claim 25 is allowable for at least this reason.

Further, independent claims 30, 42, 54, 66, 114, and 121 recite the same or similar feature(s), and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons, so that dependent claims 27-29, 32-41, 44-53, 56-65, 68-77, 118-121, and 125-128 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons.

Regarding claims 78-113, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Tamano, nor Baldo, nor any proper combination of the two, discloses all of the limitations of at least independent claims 78, 87, 96, 105.

For example, independent claim 78 recites, "wherein a luminescent region added a luminescent material is provided in the mixed region," which is not disclosed or suggested by Tamano, Baldo, nor any proper combination of the two.

Further, independent claims 87, 96, and 105 recite the same or similar feature(s), and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons, so that dependent claims 79-86, 88-95, 97-104, and 106-113 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons.

Based on the above, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is hereby requested in the Examiner's next official communication.


Applicant : Satoshi Seo et al.
Serial No. : 10/026,064
Filed : December 21, 2001
Page : 28 of 28

Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-
087001 / US5381/5474/5502

Enclosed is a \$790.00 check for check for the Request for Continued Examination fee.
Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 17, 2004



William G. Hughes, Jr.
Reg. No. 46,112

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331